



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/343,969	06/30/1999	STEVE BLUMENAU	E0295/7097	8523

7590 08/12/2003
ROBERT A SKRIVANEK JR
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS PC
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210

EXAMINER

DINH, DUNG C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PP4

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/343,969	Applicant(s) BLUMENAU ET AL.	
	Examiner Dung Dinh	Art Unit 2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-85 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-85 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 5/27/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that the combination of Chen and Bormann is improper because Chen's system is centrally controlled by the internet appliance 110 whereas Bormann's system is distributed and that nowhere does Chen suggest management of the Internet appliance. The argument is not persuasive because it is misdirected.

Chen teaches that the storage device 180 is shared. The Internet appliance has certain portion of storage mapped to it on the storage device 180. Chen teaches that the Internet appliance is defined as a "user" to the storage device 180 [col.5 line 7]. The Internet appliance can automatically authenticate and logon to the storage device 180. Chen further discloses that if another component on the network is not a defined user of the storage device 180, access to the storage device 180 is denied [col.5 lines 25-27]. This implies that there are plural network components from various locations can automatically logon to the storage device 180. Chen does not disclose any management feature to monitor accesses to the storage device 180. Hence, one of ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 2153

would have been motivated to look for teaching to monitor and manage logon activities on the storage device 180. Bormann teaches a GUI management system for monitoring logon status of plural "operators" to a network switch (Bormann defines "operators" to include any person or device interacting with the network switch) [col.3 lines 35-46]. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to apply Bormann's management system to Chen so as to enable managing and monitoring of logons to the storage device 180.

Applicant argued that Chen "authorized users" are users of workstations A-E (citing to col.5 lines 16-33). The argument is not persuasive. Chen specifically discloses that the Internet appliance is a user (i.e. authorized user) to the storage device 180. Chen does not disclose the Internet appliance use the ID of workstations A-E as the authorized user to logon to the storage device 180 as argued by applicant.

Applicant argued that the Internet appliance is identified to the file server as a "user" and not as a host processor as claimed. The argument is not persuasive because the usage of the term "user" in Chen, like the term "operator" in Bormann, clearly includes devices. The Internet appliance is a computing device; hence it inherently has a processor. Since the Internet appliance is a processing device and it hosts applications for

Art Unit: 2153

the workstations A-E [see col.5 lines 34-36], it is a host processor as claimed.

As per claims 62-85, applicant argued that Chen discloses access to folder; a folder is not a volume as claimed. The argument is not persuasive because a 'folder' and providing email applicant is merely a preferred embodiment [col.4 lines 50-55]. However, Chen generic discloses that the shared remote storage device is used in place of a physical hard disk in the Internet appliance [col.3 lines 39-68]. Chen discloses allocating a portion of the mass storage device as remote storage for the Internet appliance [col.4 lines 34-37]. As is well known in the art, allocating a portion of network storage to a device includes allocating a logical storage volume. Hence, assigning a network storage volume to a device is within the teaching of Chen.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2153

Claims 1 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. US patent 6,041,345 and further in view of Bormann et al. US patent 6,157,378.

As per claims 1 and 37, Chen teaches a storage system [col.4 lines 34-41 - mass storage devices 180] that is assessable by a plurality of processors [col.3 lines 56-68 - Internet appliances and other network components] over a network. Chen teaches assigning to each processor a portion of the storage system [col. 4 lines 34-36, col.5 lines 15-34]. Chen does not teach displaying representation of processors that are logged into the storage system. Chen does not teach any means for administering the storage system. Bormann teaches a method for coordinate and administer a system where plural operators can simultaneously logged into the system by providing a graphical user interface that displays representation of processors that are logged into the system and displays the login information [see 3 lines 35-45, col.8 lines 1-11, claim 1]. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the teaching of Bormann et al. to Chen et al. because it would have provided a graphical interface for coordinating and managing accesses to the storage system of Chen.

Art Unit: 2153

Claims 2-36 and 38-61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen and Bormann and further in view of Jacoby US patent 5,768,552.

As per claims 2-36 and 38-61, Chen and Bormann do not teach displaying representation of path through the network over which each processor is logged into the storage system. Jacoby teaches a graphical method for monitoring and display connections to enable an administrator to visually monitor connection paths on the network in real-time [abstract, col.2 lines 34-37, col.4 lines 35-40]. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the network management method of Jacoby to the system of Chen because it would have provided real-time activity status to the storage system. Jacoby teaches displaying connection paths and graphical representation of host processor [fig.3's] at various level of details. The various presentations of information and commands would have been apparent in the system as modified.

Jacoby does not teach displaying a graphical representation of a network card to on which a respective processor is logged into the storage system. The graphical image chosen to represent a host processor would clearly have been a matter of design choice because the image chosen would not have affected the underlying management function.

Art Unit: 2153

Claims 62-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen et al. US patent 6,041,345 and further in view of IBM TDB No.NB9203306 "Graphical User Interface for Security Administration."

As per claims 62, 68, 74, and 80, Chen discloses method for changing access privileges to portion of data on a storage system over a network [fig.2, col.5 lines 5-15]. Chen does not teach a graphical user interface for displaying and enabling modification of the privileges in response to a graphical selection. The IBM TDB teaches providing a graphical user interface for security administration. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the teaching of the IBM TDB with Chen et al. because it would have provided means to administer the system from a graphical user interface and prevented the administrator from having to know or remember commands or syntax to accomplish the task.

Chen does not specifically use the term "volume". However, Chen teaches the network storage is used as a replacement for actual physical hard drive in the Internet appliance; hence, the allocated network storage functions as a storage volume as claimed because the Internet appliance would have accessed the network storage in place of a physical local hard drive.

Art Unit: 2153

As per claims 63-67, 69-73, 81-85, it is apparent that the system as modified would have the steps of displaying graphical presentation and modifying of access privileges in response to selection of the graphical presentation. The IBM TDB reference does not teach displaying a graphical representation of a network card to graphically represent a host processor. It graphical image chosen to represent a host processor would clearly a matter of design choice because the image chosen would not have affected the underlying function of the graphical user interface.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2153

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached at (703) 305-4792.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Box AF

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 746-7238, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE")

(703) 746-7240 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Fourth Floor (Receptionist).



Dung Dinh
Primary Examiner
August 5, 2003